

S/N: 10/603,949

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 15-16 and 37-54 were pending in the application, of which Claims 15, 43, and 47 are independent. In the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, Claims 16, 44, and 48 were objected to and Claims 43-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 15, 38-42, 47, and 50-54 were allowed. Following this response, Claims 15-16, 38-44, 46-48, and 50-54 remain in this application, with Claims 37, 45, and 49 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Allowance of Claims

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner pass Claims 15, 38-42, 47, and 50-54 to issue.

II. Objection to Claims 16, 44, and 48

In the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, the Examiner objected to Claims 16, 44, and 48 as being substantially duplicates of Claims 37, 45, and 49 respectively. Claims 37, 45, and 49 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this objection and add no new matter.

S/N: 10/603,949

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 43 has been amended to recite that the computer-implemented computer application is stored on the memory storage unit, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

S/N: 10/603,949


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 16, 2007

DKS:ARL:mdc


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

